

(For circulation from hand to hand throughout the United States)

DO NOT DESTROY; READ; INVESTIGATE; THINK; ACT; and then LEND this paper to a neighbor of whatever party. Insist upon its return to you. Then lend it again and again. Procure copies for the use of those willing to cooperate.

The Freeport Plan

PART 1, Revised

(PUBLISHED BY THE WOMEN'S TARIFF FEDERATION.)

A BRIEF IN BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THEIR DESCENDANTS

The obligation to find out in advance what principle one is about to vote to uphold and to reach a conclusion thereon without prejudice or selfish motive is a patriotic duty of the first importance.

THE FREEPORT PLAN—A FOUR-YEAR NATIONAL CAMPAIGN, TO BE CONDUCTED THROUGH THE AGENCY OF AND AT THE EXPENSE OF SMALL CLUBS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, TO ENCOURAGE THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND, ESPECIALLY, TO SPREAD THE KNOWLEDGE THAT SO-CALLED "PROTECTION," BY HIGH TARIFF RATES, AMOUNTS, IN ACTUAL PRACTICE, SIMPLY TO A LICENSE TO ROB THE MASS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FAVORED FEW.

THE TARIFF ISSUE CAN NEVER BE TAKEN OUT OF POLITICS UNTIL THE PEOPLE SHALL HAVE ACQUIRED A MORE THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THE SUBJECT AND SHALL HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR CONCLUSION IN A MANNER NOT TO BE MISINTERPRETED BY THE SPECIAL INTERESTS.

There are millions of men and women in this country, not among the favored few, who in the past have voted to uphold so-called "protection," but who in future would surely insist upon equality of opportunity among all

the people and special privileges to none, if they would but ascertain for themselves just what "protection," in actual practice, really means.

It is essential, therefore, to afford to the American people, including our adversaries, ample opportunity of realizing the accuracy of the following nine propositions:

I. Under so-called "protection," the American consumers have heretofore been (and will again be) compelled to pay 20 per cent to upward of 100 per cent more than they would have to pay otherwise, not merely for products imported from abroad, but also for articles produced in the United States, and, that too, for the benefit of foreign, as well as American investors.

(See *The Tariff and The Trusts*, by Franklin Pierce, late of the New York Bar, at pp. 26, 30-31, 42, 63-65, 73, 236, 280, 282; *The Tariff*, by Lee Francis Lybarger, of the Philadelphia Bar, at pp. 15, 18, 21, 21-26, 28, 167-170, 172-179; *The Tariff in Our Times*, by Ida M. Tarbell, of New York, at pp. 23, 30, 31, 59, 61, 105, 149, 161, 262-263, 269-270, 278, 290-291, 292, 333, 334; *Tariff History of the United States*, 5th ed., by Dr. F. W. Taussig, one-time professor of economics in Harvard University and formerly chairman of the Federal Tariff Commission, at pp. 398-399, and *Some Aspects of the Tariff Question*, by the last named author, at pp. 9-10. The foregoing authorities will hereinafter be referred to by mentioning the author's name, except that Dr. Taussig's two books will be distinguished as "Tariff History" and "Tariff Questions." See also, generally, Dr. Taussig's *Tariff Book* published in 1920; *Wealth of Nations*, by Adam Smith, sometimes called the *Father of Modern Political Economy*, and a volume, copyrighted in 1889, by Worthington & Co., and containing what the compiler, H. W. Furber, of New Hampshire, considered the best arguments for and against "protection" that had theretofore been written. Public libraries and club libraries should contain some authorities upon the tariff question.)

The proposition stated above is one of the usual practical results of a "protective" tariff (Tarbell, 292-293), and a few illustrations will be sufficient: While "protective" tariff laws were in force, steel rails, selling here for \$28 a ton, were sold in Europe for \$20; sewing machines were sold here for \$45 and \$50 and in South America for \$25; agricultural machinery was sold abroad for 20 per cent less than the farmer paid here (Lybarger, 167-168; Pierce, 73); the Borax Company, an English corporation, mined borax in California and Nevada, and, in 1904, sold its product here at $7\frac{3}{4}$ cents a pound, while the export price was only $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, thus compelling Americans to pay to foreigners over three times as much as foreign consumers paid for a product found in this country (Pierce, 64-65; Lybarger, 199); Mr. Keene, a New York jeweler, found it profitable to buy American made watches in London, re-ship them to this country and sell for \$6 a watch for which others charged \$20; and the watch manufacturers compelled the retailers in this country to agree to sell at \$28 or \$32.50 the same watch that was offered in the Balkan States for \$10 (*Tariff Hearings* (1913), *Committee on Ways and Means*, House of Representatives, at pp. 1750-1753; see also Lybarger, 170).

Money is invested wherever the largest and safest profit is expected; and when the *Alien Enemy Property Custodian* shall have finished his work the American people will be in a better position to imagine the extent to which foreign investors of all countries have been benefited by the "protec-

live" tariff acts enacted by our Congress. The facts and figures already published indicate to some extent the amount that had been invested here by Germans alone.

Besides, over 90% of American producers are engaged in occupations that cannot possibly be affected by foreign competition. (Test this assertion by United States census records or by canvassing any gathering.) Assuming that foreign competition might injure the remaining 10% (though, in fact, it would not), ought we, in any event, to permit all to be robbed in order that 10% may be enriched unjustly?

The fact that the consumer's vote has been captured at each succeeding election by successfully concealing knowledge from him that he has been thus plundered has merely added insult to injury. And it is substantially correct to say that the only necessary or comfort of life that was immune from being enhanced in price by the practical effect of the "protective" tariff system in force prior to 1913 was the air we breathed (Pierce, 217, 234-237; Lybarger, 20-26, 170-180); and the same condition arises under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. The effect of that act in bringing about high prices of iron and steel products is pointed out in a pamphlet published in January, 1923, under the direction of H. E. Miles, of 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.

It is true that section 315 of the present tariff act empowers the President to decrease rates of duty to the extent of 50%, but, clearly, American consumers will thereby be afforded no relief; for the President has declined to reduce the tariff on sugar, even in the face of the fact that the Canadian reduction of the tariff rate on raw sugar has resulted in the reduction of the price of refined sugar to Canadian consumers.

So-called "protection" interferes with the operation of the natural law of supply and demand; and since the American consumer suffered because the conflict in Europe added to the demand and diminished the supply of the necessities of life, it is but right that he should, in turn, be permitted, by the operation of the same factors, to enjoy the benefit of lower prices when strife in Europe ceases and normal production is resumed.

II. Under "protective" tariff acts in force in the past, the Government received, in revenue, less than 10 per cent of the amount that was wrung from the American people by means of so-called "protection" and the balance went toward swelling the profits of those who were thus placed in a position to raise the prices of their products sold in this country; and a similar condition is brought about under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act.

(Pierce, 138, 217; Lybarger, 66, 180-185, 270-271; see also "Tariff Questions," 9-10.)

The result thus stated arose in the past from the facts (1) that, while tariff duties were collectable, not at all from articles of commerce produced in the United States, but only from such commodities as were imported from abroad, yet the prices to the American consumer of domestic products were raised by an amount substantially equal to the "protective" tariff upon foreign articles that would otherwise have competed in price therewith (Lybarger, 270-271) and (2) that the American people consumed a far greater quantity of domestic products, which were thus subjected to an artificial increase in price (though

the Government received no part thereof), than they consumed of foreign products, upon which a tariff duty was actually paid to the Government, the amount of our domestic commerce having been about thirty-five times the value of imports (Lybarger, 121, 133; Pierce, 18-19, 138; "Tariff Questions," 9-10).

Certainly no system of taxation can be just that requires the taxpayer to part with a dollar in order that the Government may receive less than a dime.

Is it not far better to raise the revenue required by direct taxation, in order that the people may know what is being exacted by way of taxation and that the entire amount collected will reach the Federal treasury? Besides, the Federal Government now raises the major part of the revenue required by taxing corporations, decedent estates and incomes and only a smaller fraction thereof from tariff duties on imports.

Moreover, the object of "protection" is, not to raise revenue, but to shut out foreign commodities from this country, thereby preventing the collection of tariff duties thereon. In fact, the McKinley "protective" tariff act is frankly entitled "An act to reduce the revenue," etc. (U. S. Statutes at Large, 1890, chap. 1244; see also Lybarger, 278, 273, 294).

III. The imposition, by "protective" tariff acts, of specific duties, based upon weight, measure or number of lines (as in the case of buttons), where different grades of the same product have been affected, resulted in compelling the American consumers of the cheaper grades of hundreds of articles to pay a tax of 111 per cent to 280 per cent, while the purchasers of the more expensive grades were required to pay but 60 per cent to 86 per cent.

(Pierce, 26, 42, 289-290; Lybarger, 175-179, 171-174, 280-281, 296.)

Over 1900 years ago Julius Cæsar imposed tariff rates of only 3 per cent upon the "barbarians" he conquered (Lybarger, 204), yet, for nearly fifty years prior to 1913, the patient American people submitted to the extortions and injustice hereinabove mentioned. The average tariff rate under our first tariff act of 1789 was $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Thus Alexander Hamilton considered $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent sufficient to give all necessary protection to our then infant industries; and he doubted the wisdom of the long continuance of the policy (Lybarger, 249; Pierce, 5, 216). The highest rate in the tariff act of 1816 was 25 per cent. Duties were then imposed to encourage infant industries and to establish a more diversified industrial condition in our country, were intended to be removed within three years and affected a list of articles so brief as to be printed on a page about a foot square (Pierce, 253-257; Lybarger, 248-253). At the beginning of the European war, England, where there had been no so-called "protection" since 1849 (Pierce, 330), certainly had industries as diversified as our own, although her natural resources were not comparable to ours; and, besides, she had the greatest tonnage in merchant ships afloat, while our once great merchant fleet, because of the effect of our "protective" tariff policy, had been driven from the seas (Pierce, 99-100, 105-106, 108-109; Tarbell, 255, 61-62; 203). The American people now know how necessary ships are to the conduct of modern warfare. And let it always be remembered that it is the American consumer, not the foreign or domestic merchant, that ultimately pays, not merely the amount of the tariff duty, but, in addition, a profit based thereon to each middleman through whose hands the merchandise has passed (Lybarger, 62, 66, 263, 270-271; Tarbell, 150, 151; Pierce, 42, 138, 216).

IV. While it is quite true that, under "protective" tariff laws, a few men (including foreigners), thus licensed to levy tribute from the American people, have amassed large fortunes, general prosperity has come, never because of "protection," but in spite of it.

Prosperity, in the last analysis, is derived from "Mother Earth"; though our people's energy, resourcefulness, inventive genius and adaptability to the use of improved machinery and methods, as well as the unrestricted commerce we enjoy among our forty-eight states have also contributed thereto. (Pierce, 215, 223, 240, 244, 294; "Tariff Questions," 40-49; Lybarger, 196-200, 206-209; see also "Wealth of Nations," Book IV., ch. II, p. 354; "Tariff Questions," 40-41, 43, 49, 194-195, 201, 280-281, 284.)

Panics and business depressions have heretofore arisen, not by reason of low tariff rates, but because of conditions entirely distinct therefrom ("Tariff History," 107-108, 121, 216-218, 287; 319-320; Lybarger, 289-293; Pierce, 261-264, 273-274; Tarbell, 238, 239, 254). Yet a majority of the American people have been deceived into the fantastic belief that the panic of 1893 was caused by an event that took place a year thereafter, namely, by the passage of the tariff act of August 28, 1894 (Lybarger, 285, 289-290; Tarbell, 238-240, 236; "Tariff History," 319-320). The truth is that the McKinley "protective" tariff act had then been in force since October 1, 1890, and that the industrial depression had commenced in the fall of 1890 (Lybarger, 290, 273). The worst of all the panics, that of 1907, came during a period when "protectionists" had been in control of the Government for upward of ten years and while the Dingley "protective" tariff act of 1897 was still in force (Lybarger, 291). However, it should be noted at this point that the Federal Reserve Act will obviate a recurrence of a financial panic like that of 1907 and will make it very difficult for the special interests to bring about a "hand-made" panic to intimidate the mass of the people.

The removal of so-called "protection" does not stop the prosperity of a lawful business, but merely eliminates extortion and brings about a just result, e. g.: in 1878 quinine sold here for \$4.75 an ounce; in 1879 the "protective" tariff duty thereon was removed; the price of quinine fell to \$1.23 an ounce in 1883 and to 16½ cents in 1906 and yet the business prospers (Tarbell, 280, 93-94; see also "Tariff History," 359, 360).

V. The contention that "protection" raises wages and benefits the American laborer will never become convincing until human nature ceases to control the motives of men, since, whether there be high tariff, low tariff or no tariff, the employer will secure the labor he requires as cheaply as he can.

(Lybarger, 111-120, 189-194; Pierce, 182-219; Tarbell, 338-346; 349-350; "Tariff Questions," 31-34, 34-35; 36-37. Taussig's tariff book published in 1920, pp. 48-51; 140-141.)

The reader knows that he himself does not pay more than the prevailing rate of wages for a day's work. Why should he think that the "protected" industries make a practice of presenting to their employees a part of the "spoils"? Indeed, in 1912, Theodore Roosevelt declared that a "protective" tariff does not appear in the "pay envelope" of the American wage earners (Lybarger, 189-190). But, even if such were the fact (it is not), there is no justification for compelling, by statute, the great mass of the

people to contribute to a fund to pay the employees of the various trusts and manufacturers in this country.

Wages were higher in this country than abroad before any "protective" tariff was levied here (Lybarger, 113, 114). In the early days that fact furnished an argument against "protection;" and it was not until 1840 that any one even contended that "protection" benefited labor ("Tariff History," 65-66, Lybarger, 111-113). High tariff rates usually make high prices, but high wages are not the result of high prices. ("Tariff History," 365). Wages depend, not upon any "protective" tariff, but upon the operation of the law of supply and demand, the energy, intelligence and efficiency of the employee, and the effectiveness of the services rendered (Pierce 213, 215; "Tariff History," 365-367; "Tariff Questions," 31, 32, 34; Lybarger, 111-120). While the woolen and cotton goods industries were among the most highly "protected," the wages paid by those industries were among the lowest for labor of the character of services required (Tarbell, 342), but carpenters, brick masons and other similar artisans, though not employed in any "protected" industry, have always received among the highest pay for their work. Besides, when measured by the labor cost per unit of product, that is, by the cost per ton, yard or other measure, particularly where large quantities of the same pattern are produced, the American labor, notwithstanding the higher rate of wages, is, because of its greater effectiveness, the cheapest in the world (see "Tariff Questions" 39-41, 43, 49, 194-197, 200-201, 280-281, 284; Lybarger, 329-331.) The late Andrew Carnegie, in 1909, quoted the steel corporation's latest report, showing an average profit of \$15.50 per ton, and, referring to the plant at Gary, Indiana, added: "The cost of producing rails at Gary won't be half as much as in England, notwithstanding the cheaper cost of labor abroad."

It should also be borne in mind that labor is but a small part of the cost of production. In 1900, when the Dingley "protective" act was in force, 17½ per cent of the cost of manufactured articles was the proportion paid for labor, but the average rate of "protection" afforded to the manufacturers was then at least 50 per cent upon the entire value. Thus, "protection" operated to give the manufacturer the labor he required free of cost and to present him with a bonus of 32½ per cent besides (Pierce, 211-212). The condition of laborers in England steadily improved after 1849, when "protection" was abandoned there, while the condition of laborers in countries where so-called "protection" was in force steadily grew worse (Pierce, 218; Lybarger, 114, 329). Moreover, in normal times, wages in England are higher than those in any "protectionist" country in Europe (Lybarger, 329-340).

VI. While our farmers, in common with other consumers, have been, and will again be, systematically plundered by the operation of so-called "protection," high tariff rates upon farm products are not beneficial, but positively detrimental to the interests of farmers, excepting wool and sugar growers; and the duties on farm products have been included in "protective" tariff acts merely to deceive the farmers and to capture votes.

(Pierce, 223-229, 230-237, 240, 242; "Tariff Questions," 30-49; Tarbell, 196, 197, 201, 202, 203, 204; Lybarger, 104-110, 88, 89, 96, 100-102.)

Our farmers, except the sugar planters and wool growers (Pierce, 225; "Tariff Questions," 97-99), have a comparative advantage in practically

every thing they raise, produce more than enough to supply the home market at a cost lower than other countries and must export a large yearly surplus for sale abroad, and, in the nature of things, tariff or no tariff, the prices of their products could not be affected by foreign competition (see also "The Tariff and the Farmer," by J. G. Carlisle, published in *The Forum*, January, 1890, Vol. 8, pp. 475-488).

In the *American Farm Bureau Federation Weekly News Letter* of January 11, 1923, published in the *Congressional Record* of March 15, 1923, at p. 5828, the annual net loss to American agriculture, by reason of the operation of the *Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act*, is estimated at \$300,000,000, without adding anything at all for the "pyramiding" of duties between the producer or importer and the final consumer. Yet, we all know that each middleman exacts his percentage of profit based upon what he pays for the merchandise itself and because of the tariff as well. Thus, clearly, the loss is even greater than the estimate. Obviously, the remedy is to eliminate from the federal statutes so-called "protection," to the end that the farmer (1) may, like other consumers, procure what he requires at a fair price without artificial enhancement and (2) may, like other producers, have wider foreign markets for his products under a condition permitting American credits to pay therefor continually to arise in foreign countries from the proceeds of imports into this country from abroad.

VII. So-called "protection" is fundamentally dishonest and even destructive of the moral fiber of the nation; for any process by which property is taken or permitted to be taken without consideration from one individual for the benefit of another is contrary to equity and good conscience.

(Pierce, 63-65, 118, 120, 124-132, 135, 138, 235-240; Tarbell, 329-330, 356, 357; Lybarger, 42-44, 64-67).

Besides, "protection" does not create any wealth. It accomplishes the distribution of wealth by taking it from the masses and placing it into the hands of a few (Lybarger, 70-74, 200); and it ought to be self-evident to us all that a people may not "be enriched by their own taxation," particularly, when that taxation is, not for the public benefit, but for the enrichment of a few private individuals, including foreign investors. (Lybarger, 64-67; Pierce, 138, 217).

VIII. So-called "protection" results in an irreparable yearly national loss to our country.

(Lybarger, 195-200; see also the authorities cited under subd. I. hereof.)

Bearing in mind that some localities and conditions are better adapted than others to the production of certain articles of commerce, let us answer the question as to whether we should, if we could, build a tariff wall around our country, in order that there might be established in the country an industry, lucrative to its owners alone, for the cultivation (in hot houses) and the canning of pineapples and thus impose upon all residing in the county and upon no others the necessity of paying from 50 per cent to 150 per cent more than we should otherwise have to pay for pineapples, while the people residing in adjoining counties could purchase the same product at a price reduced by the amount of the tariff rate imposed.

Would it not be more reasonable to permit the capital and the labor that would be required in the pineapple industry to engage in the production of something that would require less capital and less labor to create an article of equal or greater value in the markets of the world and then to purchase pineapples at the lower price paid elsewhere? (See *Wealth of Nations*, Routledge Ed., p. 346; Pierce, 202, 203.)

For over 70 years England imposed import duties for revenue only upon such articles as tea and coffee and received freely the products of the cheapest labor of India, the Orient and the rest of the world. Yet England grew in financial strength and its industries prospered, notwithstanding the far higher rate of wages paid there. (See Taussig's tariff book of 1920, p. 51.)

As far back as July 2, 1820, Daniel Webster warned us that protection was "a policy that could not be followed without great national injury." (Pierce, 257; Lybarger, 252.)

Theodore Roosevelt declared in his *Life of Thomas H. Benton*: "Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice (black type ours)." (See *American Statesmen*, Standard Library Edition. Vol. XXIII., p. 60.)

If there be any industries in this country that are now unable to compete upon equal terms with similar industries in other countries, without requiring the American people to submit to the injustice that necessarily results from so-called "protection," that fact establishes that some other country has a comparative advantage over ours in those industries, either because of climatic conditions or for some other reason, and that it would be far better to divert the capital and the labor, thus employed here at a disadvantage, to the conduct of one of our many industries in which our country excels all others (see "*Tariff Questions*," 30-49). The truth is however, that few, if any, industries in this country are now really dependent upon "protection" in order to be prosperous. ("*Tariff History*," 359.) "Protection" serves merely to permit the special interests to control the home market and thus to plunder the home folk.

IX. Though hitherto a debtor nation and one with an inconsequential mercantile marine, our country has, as between it and any other country, emerged from the war a creditor nation, with a large tonnage in merchant ships; and, thus, since the war, foreign commerce is of far greater importance to the producers (as well as to the consumers) of our country than ever before, for those ships must be kept busy in order to yield a return on the vast amount of capital invested and to furnish employment to our stalwart men, who, during the war, have been employed in shipping enterprises, and our industries must find outlets for their products in the markets of the world.

(See Pierce, 100-116, 181; Tarbell, 61-62, 203, 255; Lybarger, 120-124, 125-135; "*Tariff History*," 22.)

International trade amounts but to the exchange of commodities. Money is merely a medium of exchange. It is not possible for us to export our products for an indefinite period without also importing commodities from other countries. The rate of exchange would render such one sided intercourse unprofitable and would cause our exports to cease by diverting the business to other countries between which the rate of ex-

change would be more favorable. While "protection" has not completely cut off international trade from our country, the damage to our commerce wrought by the policy of "protection" merely varies in degree and not in principle. The fact that in future large yearly interest payments and freight charges will accrue in favor of our country but emphasizes the necessity of importing in order that we may export. As between individuals, so as between nations, trade breeds trade and friendship. Exports and imports, under normal conditions, increase or diminish at the same time. Consequently, if by high "protective" tariff rates, we legislate to prevent foreign countries from selling to us, we at the same time hamper the exporting of our products to them; and, besides, by such legislation we invite similar legislation on their part to prevent the sale of our commodities in their markets. Plainly, such a course results in a national loss of enormous proportions, not only because our ships thus stand idle and unproductive, but also because foreign markets for our products are thus cut off. Prior to the European war we exported only about 5 per cent of our annual production and our imports were in an even smaller proportion to our total annual consumption (Lybarger, 121), the difference being made up by the amount of interest, dividends, rents and freight charges we were then paying to foreigners (see Lybarger, 137-138). Besides, high tariff rates restricting commerce between nations nourish animosity, which often results in war (Pierce, 134).

The fact that, notwithstanding the higher wages paid in this country, the products of our factories are, under normal conditions, sold in every quarter of the globe demonstrates that, upon equal terms, we can and do successfully compete with foreign countries in the markets of the world (Pierce, 233-234; Lybarger, 120-125; "Tariff Questions," 36-37, 39, 194-198, 200-201; Tarbell, 92-94; 104-105; "Tariff History," 359).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Manifestly, it is unfair to the people to limit a discussion of public questions to the short period that measures the duration of a presidential campaign. Comparatively few attend political meetings held by a party other than their own; and, during the 1916 campaign, it was found that men, ordinarily intelligent, though under an entire misapprehension as to the effect of the "protective" tariff system they contemplated voting to uphold, would listen to nothing and investigate nothing that was inconsistent with their blind partisan prejudices. Our campaign is founded upon an appeal, not to the prejudices, but to the intelligence and sense of justice of the voters. The theory of the campaign is so to arouse the interest of the people that they at once will look into the tariff question and, without haste, decide it for themselves. The public's sole protection against "protection" is the power of its combined votes. For the blessings of freedom we owe to our Government more than we can ever repay. But our form of Government cannot endure, if, as has too often been the case, the vast majority of the American people supinely permit all the thinking to be done by a selfish few. Before November 1924, let no one be able to make the humiliating admission that he or she intends to vote with any given party, irrespectively of the principle involved, merely because his or her father did so or because such, in his or her opinion, tends toward his or her own selfish, social, financial or political advancement.

The fact that enormous sums of money must be raised to meet the expense of the war makes it imperative at this time to demonstrate to the American people that the raising of revenue by high tariff rates is the most iniquitous method of taxation that has yet been devised. The responsibility upon each of us in the premises is measured by the influence, which, by a determined effort, it is possible for him to exert upon the intelligence and sense of justice of his friends, acquaintances and others of whatever party toward inducing them to investigate and to understand what so-called "protection," in actual practice, really means.

The temptation is now very great to resort to indirect taxation in order to raise the revenue required. It was the expense due to the Civil War that was the primary circumstance and excuse that enabled the selfish interests (including some foreign capitalists) to fasten upon our country the incubus of "protection" with which the American people were burdened for about fifty years prior to 1913 ("Tariff History," 193, 228; Lybarger, 248, 261-262; Pierce, 44, 216, 217; Tarbell, 26-27, 30, 172). It should also be noted that after his election President Lincoln declared that he had "by no means a thoroughly matured judgment upon" the tariff question and that the tariff acts passed during the Civil War were for "revenue only" (Tarbell, 19, 20, 26; Lybarger, 261) and were enacted to preserve the ante bellum state of inter-national competition, since usually an internal revenue tax had first been levied on domestic products (Tarbell, 30; Lybarger, 261). Both internal and external taxes were then understood to be temporary. The difficulty arose after the civil war when the selfish interests procured the reduction or removal of internal revenue taxes and the gradual increase of tariff duties on foreign products (Lybarger, 261, 262).

Let each advocate of just government undertake for himself "to spread the knowledge" by attempting to induce citizens of all parties to read this pamphlet and to make a study of the tariff issue and of other public questions. No embarrassment need be felt in approaching any voter upon this subject; for, though deceived into the belief that so-called "protection" is a necessary evil, essential, and not harmful, to our national welfare and that it is beneficial to American labor, our adversaries, with the exception of a selfish few (some of whom may not have been conscious of a selfish motive), are as patriotic as ourselves, and desire as earnestly to render justice to the mass of the American people.

JOHN M. HARRINGTON.

Dated, Freeport, N. Y., September, 1924.

Note: The recent "Tariff Primer", by Lee Francis Lybarger, Mifflinburg, Penn., is short and convincing. Your public library may contain a copy.

To any voter, of whatever political inclination:

- (1) "The Freeport Plan" of campaign was initiated at Freeport, New York, in November, 1916, has received the cordial approval of citizens of at least 35 states, has been used extensively in the State of New York, and has been approved, endorsed and adopted by the Women's Tariff Federation (a nation-wide organization). The campaign is of 4 years duration and starts anew the day after each presidential election.
- (2) The objects of the Women's Tariff Federation are:

To encourage the organization of small clubs throughout the United States

for the study and discussion of public questions and in that behalf to reinforce "The Freeport Plan" of campaign; to invite all such clubs and other organizations to affiliate with the Federation; to engage the co-operation of existing clubs and other organizations as well as individual citizens, toward the promotion of the purposes of the Federation; to issue and distribute printed bulletins, circulars and pamphlets upon the tariff and other public questions and otherwise to spread correct information among the people concerning the same; to encourage individuals to induce their neighbors to read such printed matter and to study and discuss public questions; and generally to take all available measures tending to promote domestic trade and international commerce, to advance the welfare of the mass of our people and to further the cause of just government.

- (3). We earnestly appeal to all patriotic citizens for co-operation. Any resident of the United States (man or woman, over 17 years of age, of whatever political inclination) is eligible to membership, but only a woman to election as an officer. **Membership dues:** \$1 for each calendar year until resignation. Voluntary contributions, however, will be accepted.
- (4) All clubs and other organizations, heretofore or hereafter formed throughout the United States, including any Public, College, High School or Grammar School Library, League of Women Voters, Farmers' Organization, Labor Organization, Church Society or Club, Fraternal Organization, State Grange, Dairymen's League, Chamber of Commerce, Merchants' Association, Political Committee or Club, Civic Association, Community Club, Civil Service Employees' Association and College Debating Society, etc., are urged to adopt "The Freeport Plan" of campaign and to co-operate and affiliate with the Federation.
- (5) The Federation advocates the formation of one or more small clubs in each community and at each grammar school, high school, college and university in the country for the study and discussion of public questions. At club meetings both sides of any question should be presented for consideration. Local newspapers should be advised of the activities of any club. Children in public schools should be made to understand the arguments on both sides of the tariff issue and other questions. It is suggested also that the tariff be chosen as the subject of inter-collegiate debating contests. Clubs should also encourage social gatherings.
- (6) The Federation invites brief written suggestions concerning the tariff issue, the selective immigration question, the adjustment of the inter-allied debts and other public questions now clamoring for solution.
- (7) Do you not agree that fundamentally our form of government is the best in existence and that it is worth preserving?
- (8) Do you not at the same time appreciate the dangers that lurk in universal suffrage unless the electorate be informed upon public questions?
- (9) Search your conscience. Assume the responsibility that is yours. Act now; and continue to do your part.
- (10) Do you not recognize it as your moral obligation and patriotic duty to aid the mass of the American people to find out in advance something about the public questions concerning which they will be called upon to vote?
- (11) Is it right to wait until a short time before an important election, when partisan prejudice is already aroused, before attempting to induce the mass of the voters to give thought to public questions?
- (12) Do you not realize the changed aspect of the tariff question since our country has become a creditor nation?
- (13) Is it not plain to you that special privilege must be eradicated from the laws and the administration thereof?
- (14) Join our Federation now and by personal effort induce at least 25 of your friends and acquaintances of whatever political party promptly to do likewise and to co-operate in the "hand to hand," "neighbor to neighbor" campaign outlined in this pamphlet. If you wish to establish a branch consult headquarters.
- (15) Will you organize a small club in your neighborhood? Do so, even if you start with only three members. If you will not, induce some of your neighbors to take the initiative.
- (16) Will you at least see how many men and women you, by earnest endeavor, can persuade carefully to read this pamphlet and to return it to you? In some in-

stances, a single copy of "The Freeport Plan" pamphlet has been read by as many as 25 people.

- (17) Will you see to it that a copy of this pamphlet is placed and kept on file in the reading room of the public library, college library, high school library and/or grammar school library in your neighborhood? Libraries should also contain books upon the tariff and other public questions.
- (18) Will you endeavor to stimulate interest in public questions by reading aloud at any gathering extracts from this pamphlet, the books referred to therein and other arguments upon public questions?
- (19) So far as possible, "The Freeport Plan" should be conducted by personal contact with each voter. A house to house campaign is the most effective. If a personal interview be impracticable, use the mail to engage the interest of your friends. Do not overlook any voter. Lend, do not give, a copy of this pamphlet. Insist upon its return. Otherwise, the voter will think she has a lifetime to read it and will not read it at all. Before lending the pamphlet, write on it "RETURN TO" and your name. If, however, one be willing to help, have a copy sent to her.
- (20) Almost every voter may be given an opportunity to consider the contents of this pamphlet, provided we secure co-operation throughout the United States; and no copy should be wasted. If unwilling or unable to keep this pamphlet in circulation from hand to hand, please return it to the person who gave it to you or to our secretary, by mail, at a cost of 1c.
- (21) Please bear in mind that the larger the number of new members the Federation secures, the greater will be its usefulness in the rendition of public service.
- (22) **ACT NOW, LEST YOU FORGET.**

GRACE V. KING,

Dated, Freeport, N. Y., September, 1924.

President, Women's Tariff Federation.

P. S.—Not copyrighted. Subject to change when reprinted. Any club or other organization or any candidate or other individual may have this pamphlet reprinted locally or, if found less expensive, may purchase copies from the printer, McConnell Press, Inc., 52 Duane St., New York, N. Y. A rubber stamp may be used to indicate the approval and adoption of the plan by any organization or by any candidate.

PRICES: Per copy, 10c, at stationery stores or news-stands; 10c. by mail, postage prepaid; 15 copies, \$1; express collect: 200 copies, \$11; 500, \$18; 1,000, \$31; 2,000, \$58; 5,000, \$140; 10,000, \$270 from McConnell Press, Inc., 52 Duane Street, New York, N. Y. Copies of Part 2 of "The Freeport Plan" (a separate pamphlet) may also be reprinted locally or obtained at the same prices from the same printer.

WOMEN'S TARIFF FEDERATION

(A Nation-wide Organization)

Main Headquarters, 22 Miller Avenue, Freeport, N. Y.

Branches: 818 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., 704 Stewart Building, New York, N. Y., 1215 Volunteer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Officers: Mrs. Hamilton G. King, President, Mrs. Edward Tidden, First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles F. Egan, Secretary, Mrs. Benjamin D. Homan, Treasurer, Miss Harriett Frances Nathan, Auditor.

(The National Advisory Council, so far as now constituted, is composed of 37 leading Democratic women, representing almost as many states.)

MEMBERSHIP BLANK

(Type or write the following on a separate sheet and, when filled out and signed by one or more men or women, mail to **WOMEN'S TARIFF FEDERATION, 22 Miller Avenue, Freeport, N. Y.**)

We wish to become members of the **WOMEN'S TARIFF FEDERATION** and send herewith check (or money order) for \$..... payable to **THE CITIZEN'S NATIONAL BANK OF FREEPORT**, depository, to cover dues to next December 31st at \$1.00 each.

Names

Addresses

Occupations

Political
Inclination

(PART 2)

"The Freeport Plan" of campaign received the UNQUALIFIED ENDORSEMENT of the NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION held at Saratoga Springs in July, 1918.



The Freeport Plan

(Part 2)

*(FOR CIRCULATION ONLY AMONG DEMOCRATS
THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES)*

THE FREEPORT PLAN—A FOUR-YEAR NATIONAL CAMPAIGN, TO BE CONDUCTED THROUGH THE AGENCY OF AND AT THE EXPENSE OF SMALL DEMOCRATIC CLUBS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, TO ENCOURAGE THE STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND ESPECIALLY, TO SPREAD THE KNOWLEDGE THAT SO-CALLED "PROTECTION," BY HIGH TARIFF RATES, AMOUNTS, IN ACTUAL PRACTICE, SIMPLY TO A LICENSE TO ROB THE MASS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FAVORED FEW.

"THE FREEPORT PLAN" of campaign was initiated in November, 1916, received the unqualified endorsement of the New York Democratic

State Convention, held at Saratoga Springs, in July, 1918, and has met the cordial approval of a number of Democratic National Committeemen and Democratic State Chairmen and of some patriotic citizens of at least twenty-four states.

Have you read Part I of "The Freeport Plan"? The arguments contained therein are in complete accord with the principles that have been maintained by the Democratic party for more than 100 years.

Why not adopt "The Freeport Plan" of campaign in your district?

We are right upon the tariff issue. Therefore, let us be the aggressors. Let us choose the weapons. Let us press the issue.

Why hesitate and permit our adversaries to force the "protection" issue upon us (as they may) and thus place us on the defensive?

And, if the tariff issue should not be stressed during the campaign, our party will needlessly lose thousands of votes in many congressional districts because of the widespread misapprehension upon that subject.

Besides, women presumably have open minds in respect of the tariff issue; and they should be furnished with a convenient way to find out what principles our party stands for.

While it may be that the tariff question has not been the controlling issue in any election since 1892, when the late Grover Cleveland won the presidency solely upon that issue (Taussig's "Tariff History," p. 284), that issue, even though silent, has been an important factor in each succeeding national election and, no matter what other issue has arisen, a vast number, perhaps millions, have voted against our candidates solely because they still think there is some magic in "protection."

The tariff issue we have with us always:

During the 1916 national campaign our adversaries expended vast sums of money in the East in making false prophesies, by publishing cartoons and otherwise, in respect of the alleged devastating effect of the continued operation of the Democratic Tariff Act and in spreading the false notion that but for the European War a panic would have arisen in 1914 as the result of that tariff act.

A former national chairman of the opposition party once made the following untenable statement: "It was Republican protective tariff policies that made the wages of American laboring men the highest in the world." (New York Times Magazine, June 30, 1918.)

In February, 1917, Congressman Hicks' "Washington Letter," published in the rural newspapers throughout Long Island, N. Y., contained the following statement: "The opposition of the Republicans was due to their belief that a large part of the revenue required could be raised by a protective tariff without resort to the drastic provisions incorporated in the bill.

"It is estimated that a protective tariff on present imports would yield to the government annually at least \$100,000,000 more than is now received in custom receipts."

In 1918 Congressman **Fordney** said: "If we had the Payne rates of duty in effect today our imports would yield \$518,000,000 of revenue instead of \$168,000,000." (*New York World*, Friday, July 12, 1918, at p. 11.)

Congressman **Cannon**, formerly Speaker of the House, in an alleged interview published in *The Saturday Evening Post*, of September 14, 1918, entitled "Why Pay the Tax?" says at page 106: "That deficit could be lessened by the revival of higher customs duties such as we had in the Payne-Aldrich Law," and **craftily** suggesting that the foreign producers pay the taxes imposed by "protection" in this country, and referring to the soldiers who would return after the war, adds at page 109: "I am inclined to think that no men will see clearer the wisdom of again extending our Federal taxation to the products of other countries when they come here to find a market in competition with our production and labor, so that the foreign producers shall pay for that privilege just as do our domestic producers who are taxed for enjoying the home market."

Rural newspapers throughout the country are constantly boosting "protection," not only as a means of raising revenue, but as an alleged guarantee of prosperity, and from time to time publish false statements that low tariff rates have been responsible for panics and business depressions in the past and will result in the closing of factories throughout the country. (See Part 1 pamphlet, subds. II, IV and VII.)

"Protection" is even preached by teachers in public schools.

The suggestion that the object of "protection" is to raise revenue is due either to **insincerity** or to ignorance (see **Hayne's** speech, on the reduction of tariff duties, in reply to Clay; *Niles Register*, January 28, 1832, vol. 41, pp. 396-408; *Gales & Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress*, Part I, of vol. VIII, pp. 78-103); and the proposition that the foreigner pays the tax is as **dishonest** as it is absurd (see Part 1 pamphlet, subds. I, II and III).

The **subtlety** and the **power** of "ORGANIZED GREED" are tremendous:

Has it not contrived to instill into the minds of the people the **unfounded** belief that prosperity is caused by "protection" and business depression and panics by low tariff rates? (see Part 1 pamphlet, subds. IV and VII).

Has it not **deceived** a vast number of voters into thinking that "protection" raises wages and is beneficial to the American laboring man? (see Part 1, pamphlet, subd. V.).

Has it not time and again **duped** the farmers of our country by artfully including in tariff acts duties on farm products, which would never in any event be affected by foreign competition, while at the same time robbing them by "protecting" the owners of the sources of the supplies they must have? (see Part 1 pamphlet, subds. VI., I. and III.).

Does it not in each successive campaign **intimidate** the voters by false prophecies and hypocritical threats?

Does not each of its branches **influence** its employees to vote in a manner contrary to justice and even against their own interests upon the alleged ground that the "business needs protection?" (see Part 1 pamphlet, subds. VIII., VII., X., I. and III.).

Does it not constantly carry on, through the Press, a campaign of abuse, misrepresentation and insidious suggestion designed to poison the minds of the people against the Democratic party, its policies, its elected and appointed officers and its candidates.

Was it not the Civil War debt that once enabled it to fasten "protection" upon us? (Tariff History, 5th ed., 193, 188: Lybarger, 248, 261-263).

Has it not recently made the large national debt an excuse again to satisfy its avarice?

Is it not even now scheming to create the impression that "protection" is a desirable method of raising revenue?

For over fifty years similar tactics have been pursued so relentlessly through the press and otherwise by the advocates of special privilege that the majority of the American people have been rendered incapable of thinking logically upon the subject of "protection" and entertain the most grotesque notions in regard to its effect.

So long as a voter labors under the delusion (1) that there is some magic in "protection," (2) that it operates to his own benefit or to the national advantage, (3) that it brings about higher wages or better living conditions for the American laboring man, (4) that it aids the farmer, (5) that it is a desirable method of raising revenue, or (6) that it results in prosperity and the absence of it in business depression, he simply will not vote for a Democratic candidate, whether for a local, state or federal office.

We know that "protection," in actual practice, operates as a license to the few to plunder the many. The question is: How can the widespread misapprehension of the people upon the subject be corrected and the truth made clear to them?

Campaign speeches and editorials in Democratic newspapers are not sufficient. The man or woman whose vote our party seeks and is entitled to receive neither listens to the one nor reads the other.

The only way to reach such a voter is by personal contact and that can only be accomplished through the agency of each enrolled Democrat in the election districts throughout the United States, who will undertake to interest his neighbor in the tariff question and to persuade him to investigate the subject for himself.

Every voter who insists upon right and justice should deem it a privilege to aid in a campaign to wrest the ownership of the government from the advocates of special privilege, who, when in power, enact laws which, under the guise of so-called "protection," enable a favored few unjustly to enrich themselves by impoverishing the mass of the people.

Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan" was prepared so as to answer whatever point any voter might make in favor of "protection" and cites pages of the authorities to support the arguments therein set forth, so that one who doubts may go to a library and check the accuracy of any statement therein contained.

Before Part 1 of the plan was printed the text thereof was examined and approved by tariff experts of the (tariff) Reform Club, of New York. Consequently, campaign speakers may safely rely upon its contents.

In order to win, team work is required. The tariff issue is our strongest weapon, and the local Democratic candidate or committee is helping himself, as well as his party, when he aids in a campaign upon that issue; for the great majority cast their votes according to their views upon that question alone.

Under "The Freeport Plan" each campaign is of four years' duration and starts anew the day after each presidential election. The objective is ultimately to engage the co-operation of millions of the American people throughout the United States in a determined effort to let the mass of the people know what "protection," in actual practice, really means. When the voters find how, under the guise of "protection," they have been and are plundered, in order that a few, including foreign investors, may be enriched, there will be no place in American politics for the political party that preaches or practices "protection."

SUGGESTIONS TO ORGANIZERS OF SMALL DEMOCRATIC CLUBS

1. Send to each state committeeman, to the chairman of each county committee and to each Democratic candidate a reprinted copy of Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan" and a copy of this paper, requesting that the county committeemen (or election district captains) be called together to consider the adoption of "The Freeport Plan" of campaign. Let each state committeeman and each candidate address county committee meetings. The most effective campaign is that which fires the zeal of party workers who are in close touch with the voters. Let the county committee consider passing the two resolutions printed near the end of this paper and the publication thereof in local newspapers.

2. Let several election districts be combined for the organization of each respective club; and let the executive committee of each club be composed of the president of the club and the county committeemen from the election districts thus combined for the establishment of a club. The essential and distinguishing feature of a club formed upon "The Freeport Plan" is that it must always be controlled by the regular Democratic organization of the district.

3. The voters in any district are more apt to read the Part 1 pamphlet if the name of a local democratic club be "rubber stamped" thereon. Therefore, form a club even if at first it consists of only a few county committeemen. Let each club consider passing resolutions like those printed near the end of this paper and the advisability of stating its objects in the language set forth near the end of Part 1 of the plan. Arrange to have an account of the club's action published in local newspapers. If possible, fix the initiation fee at two dollars and the monthly dues at ten cents. The local benefit to be derived from a small Democratic club in any locality will justify the club in paying the small cost of obtaining reprinted copies of the pamphlets (see note at end of this paper).

4. Let the several county committeemen forming a club, mail a reprinted copy of the two pamphlets to each enrolled Democrat in their dis-

tricts, with a notice calling a meeting of Democrats and inviting their co-operation.

5. Let the county committeeman and his lieutenants in each election district visit each enrolled Democrat, invite him to join the club and see to it that he reads the Part 1 pamphlet, or at least the part thereof that is printed in bold faced type, and understands its purpose.

6. If left to themselves not even Democrats are apt to read the pamphlets. Therefore, in order to secure their co-operation, read aloud portions of the pamphlets and point out a few instances of the outrageous injustice and of the unconscionable extortions practiced under so-called "protection" prior to 1913.

7. Let each county committeeman (and other party officials) realize that by accepting his office he has assumed a sacred trust to do what he can to perpetuate the principles of his party.

8. Let reprinted copies of the Part 1 pamphlet be placed on sale at news-stands in each election district.

9. Let each club purchase a few books upon the tariff question, obtain a copy of the Report of Congressional Tariff Hearings and copies of the Congressional Record, urge public libraries to do likewise and encourage the reading of such books as well as authorities upon other public questions.

10. Let one or more copies of the Part 1 pamphlet be placed on file in the reading room of each public library and college library in any election district.

11. Let each advocate of just government undertake for himself "to spread the knowledge" by handing a copy of the Part 1 pamphlet to any friend or acquaintance, of whatever party and of whatever occupation, who will promise to read the same and to return it or hand it to a neighbor who will make a similar promise, and by attempting to induce all citizens of good will to make a study of the tariff as well as of other public questions. Whenever a voter's interest has been engaged, request him or her to consider joining the local democratic club and enrolling as a Democrat.

12. "The Freeport Plan" of campaign should, as far as possible, be conducted by personal contact with each voter. Let the responsibility of engaging the interest of certain of their neighbors be placed upon individual Democrats in each election district. The more one does, the more he will be willing to do; and he will be content in the conviction that he is rendering a public service of the first importance. A house to house canvass is the best method; but, if a personal interview with each voter be impracticable, mail a copy of the Part 1 pamphlet to each voter of whatever party.

13. No embarrassment need be felt in approaching any voter of whatever party upon this subject; for, though many vote for our adversaries because they have been deceived as to the effect of so-called "protection" and into the belief that it is essential to our national welfare, all, save a selfish view, are as patriotic as ourselves and desire as earnestly to render justice to the mass of the American people.

14. Let each county committeeman keep a card index, showing whether

or not each voter in his district has read or promised to read the Part 1 pamphlet and the attitude of each upon the tariff question and stating the point upon which any opponent still clings to the theory of "protection." The facts should be tabulated and submitted to the party leaders, candidates and campaign speakers.

15. Encourage voters in each election district to write from time to time to Congressmen and Senators of whatever party, expressing their opinions in regard to public questions and pending legislation.

16. Always fight upon principle for right and justice. Let there be no trading with the enemy for the sake of a few loaves and fishes.

17. Impress upon the minds of each individual the fact that the survival of the principles of the Democratic party is of far more importance than the success or humiliation of any man or group of men.

18. Forgive the conduct of any Democrat, who, in the past, has contributed to the defeat of the party in a national, state or local election.

19. In future, fight out all differences among the factions of the party in the party primaries and, even if defeated, vote for the party's candidates and continue to work for the perpetuation of the principles of the party.

20. The large importance of winning local and state elections lies in preventing our adversaries from building up a political machine founded upon patronage and plunder. The Democrat, who fails to support our party's candidates, even at a local or state election, assumes a very grave moral responsibility, for thereby he helps toward enabling the opposition to become entrenched at Washington, where, when in power, the special interests write "protective" tariff schedules, which are so detrimental to the national welfare and so unjust to the mass of our people (see Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan").

21. "The Freeport Plan" concerns principles, not persons, and is nation wide in its scope. The organization that it is designed to construct is one based upon the devotion of the people to the principles of the Democratic party, and therefore, one that it will be impossible to defeat.

22. Whenever possible, let each county committeeman become personally acquainted with each voter in his election district. Each county committeeman (and each of his lieutenants) should devote his every ounce of energy to his work. If he find that he has not sufficient time so to do, he should advise the leading Democrats in his election district and request that a worthy successor be selected. Urge each county committeeman to secure as large an enrollment and registration as possible and to see to it that all who are qualified vote at the primaries and at elections. Careful instruction should be given in advance as to the legal method of voting for each Democratic candidate. Although voting for the head of a ticket at a recent election, over 100,000 men failed to express a choice as to candidates for justice of the Supreme Court in the Second Judicial District of New York.

23. If the party officials in any district fail to co-operate, let a club be established by earnest Democrats and, at the next party primary, elect

party officials who are devoted to the principles of the Democratic Party without regard to personal profit.

24. Establish a club for the study and discussion of public questions, even if there seems to be no immediate prospect of securing more than three members. Let each club hold regular meetings, and, if possible, maintain a club room where members, their friends and acquaintances may gather during any evening. Invite prominent Democrats, from time to time, to address public meetings, to which all citizens should be invited; and, if no other method be available, have the Part 1 pamphlet or excerpts from books upon the tariff question read aloud and discussed at club meetings. Take such other measures as will tend to engage the interest and co-operation of the residents of any given locality.

25. As an example to other Democrats throughout his state, let the chairman of the state committee, or his nominee, become president of a small Democratic club in his district. Let the state committeeman and the county chairman likewise become the president of a club in their respective districts.

26. Let each club in any county make a report on February 1 and May 1, in each year, to the state committeeman, showing the number of its members and the number of enrolled Democrats residing in the respective election districts from which its membership is drawn, the methods of campaign employed by the club and such other information as the state chairman may direct.

27. Let each state committeeman make a report on May 15 in each year to the chairman of the state committee, showing the progress of club organizations throughout their respective counties, giving a list of the clubs therein and describing the activities of the several clubs in the county.

28. Let the chairman of each state committee make a report on June 1 in each year to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, showing the progress of club organizations throughout his state, the methods employed by the various clubs to interest the people and the names and addresses of the clubs throughout his state.

29. Let the state chairman of any state committee communicate to the chairman of the state committee of each doubtful state and to the chairman of the national committee all improved methods of engaging the interest of the people that may have come to his attention.

30. Whenever an opportunity is afforded by any statement in any newspaper in favor of so-called "protection" let some member selected by each club write a letter to the editor (of whatever party) of each newspaper in his district and, particularly, to the editor of those published in rural communities, controverting any such assertion (a) by quoting the appropriate proposition announced in Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan," and (b) by fortifying such proposition by mentioning the books and authors referred to in the same circular, to the end that the people may be induced to investigate the tariff issue and to think for themselves.

31. Let clubs, committees and conventions (county, state, congressional and national) adopt a resolution like that passed on July 24, 1918, by the NEW YORK STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION unquali-

fiedly endorsing "The Freeport Plan" of campaign and see to it that the local newspapers of whatever party are given an opportunity of publishing the form of resolution and any other item of news that will help keep before the people the tariff issue and the activities of any club or committee. Wherever possible, let local newspaper articles contain the definition of "The Freeport Plan" as printed in bold faced type near the beginning of this paper.

32. Each county committeeman should be furnished with copies of the Part I pamphlet equal in number to the aggregate of enrolled voters (of all parties) in his election district and with at least ten copies of this paper.

33. The following legends (properly paragraphed upon slides costing about 75 cents each) have been exhibited from time to time over the name of the South Side Democratic Club, Freeport, N. Y., upon the screens of motion picture theatres in Freeport and neighboring villages:

(1) "The Freeport Plan,"—a four year national campaign to be conducted by small clubs throughout the United States. Our neighbors of whatever party are invited to join with us in the study and discussion of public questions." (2) "Have you read 'The Freeport Plan?' Each of us is under a patriotic duty to find out what principle he votes to uphold: Let no man vote with any given party merely because his father did so or because such, in his opinion, tends toward his social, financial or political advancement." (3) "Have you read 'The Freeport Plan?' A four year national campaign to encourage the study and discussion of public questions and, especially, to spread the knowledge that so-called 'protection,' by high tariff rates, amounts, in actual practice, but to a license to rob the mass of the American people," and (4) "Have you read 'The Freeport Plan.' If, by our lethargy, we, the people, permit the 'ownership' of the government to revert, in 1920, to the special interests, we shall each be guilty of moral treason. The public's sole protection against 'protection' is the power of its combined votes."

34. It is suggested that the letter-head of any club have printed thereon a statement that it has adopted "The Freeport Plan" of campaign initiated in November, 1916, by South Side Democratic Club, of Freeport, N. Y., and the definition of that plan as above printed in bold faced type.

35. Encourage Democrats at colleges and universities to organize clubs and to adopt such of the foregoing suggestions as may suit their own conditions.

36. Encourage each Democratic club already established to adopt "The Freeport Plan" of campaign in order to increase its usefulness to the party.

37. If the carrying out of these suggestions seem troublesome to any one, please bear in mind that similar methods are to be taken throughout the great state of New York, and possibly throughout each of the thirty-six states, and that each one of us should deem it a privilege to do his or her share toward perpetuating the principles of the Democratic Party. If given the tools wherewith to work, it will be found that nearly every Democrat will be willing to help. Remember, too, that the campaign is to be conducted until election day in 1924 and during each succeeding four years

thereafter, to the end that the merits of any issue may be readily presented to the people.

JOHN M. HARRINGTON, President,
South Side Democratic Club.

Dated, Freeport, N. Y., October, 1922 (Originally dated, September, 1918).

P. S.—The following resolution was adopted on July 24, 1918, by the New York Democratic State Convention:

“WHEREAS, we are mindful that the expense due to the Civil War was the primary circumstance that enabled the selfish interests to fasten upon our country the incubus of ‘protection’ with which the American people were burdened for about fifty years; and

“WHEREAS, we realize that the fact that enormous sums of money will have to be raised to meet the expenses of the national government, makes it imperative to demonstrate to the people before the approaching congressional election and before the next presidential election that the raising of revenue by high tariff rates is the most iniquitous method of taxation that has yet been devised; and

“WHEREAS, we recognize that if, by our lethargy, we permit the ‘ownership’ of the national government to revert, in 1920, to the advocates of special privilege and thus enable them, under the guise of so-called ‘protection,’ again to plunder the great mass of the American people for the benefit of a favored few, we shall each be guilty of moral treason; now, therefore, be it

“RESOLVED, that ‘THE FREEPORT PLAN’ (announced in November, 1916, by the South Side Democratic Club of Freeport, N. Y.) of a four year national campaign, to be conducted through the agency of and at the expense of small Democratic clubs throughout the United States, ‘to encourage the study and discussion of public questions and, especially, to spread the knowledge that so-called ‘protection,’ by high tariff rates, amounts, in actual practice, but to a license to rob the mass of the American people’ be and the same hereby is HEARTILY APPROVED and UNQUALIFIEDLY ENDORSED.

“RESOLVED FURTHER, that a copy of this resolution be sent to Democratic candidates for member of congress, as well as to the Democratic national committeemen and to the state chairman in each doubtful state.”

Democratic clubs, committees and conventions (county, state, congressional and national), even in democratic states and in hopeless districts, are requested to consider the adoption of a similar resolution. Democratic candidates for member of congress and for the United States Senate are requested to consider the advisability of using “The Freeport Plan” during the approaching campaign.

P. P. S.—On September 18, 1918, the Democratic County Committee of Nassau County passed the above resolution and the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, the Democratic State Convention, recently held at Saratoga Springs, adopted, without a dissenting voice, a resolution whereby 'The Freeport Plan' of campaign was heartily approved and unqualifiedly endorsed; be it:

"RESOLVED, that 'The Freeport Plan' of campaign, initiated in November, 1916, by South Side Democratic Club, of Freeport, N. Y., be and the same hereby is adopted by the Democratic County Committee, of Nassau County, New York;

"RESOLVED FURTHER that small Democratic clubs be formed throughout Nassau County by combining several election districts from which the membership of each club is to be drawn, that each enrolled Democrat be invited to join one of the small Democratic clubs thus formed, that each club adopt the same objects as those adopted in the constitution of the South Side Democratic Club of Freeport, N. Y., that the constitution of each club provide that the executive committee thereof shall be composed of the president of the club and the county committeeman from each election district furnishing 15 members to the club and that the prosecution of 'The Freeport Plan' of campaign be proceeded with throughout Nassau County, each club providing itself with the necessary number of copies of the second edition of the 4-page circular descriptive of 'The Freeport Plan' and with the necessary number of copies of the 2-page circular designated as Part II of 'The Freeport Plan' (for the use of party workers) either by having the same reprinted or by obtaining copies through E. A. Rice, treasurer of South Side Democratic Club, Freeport, N. Y.;

"RESOLVED FURTHER that each county committeeman in Nassau County be furnished with a copy of this resolution."

Democratic state committees and Democratic county committees throughout each of the thirty-six doubtful states will please consider passing a similar resolution.

(Part 1 of the plan was originally printed as a 4-page circular and Part 2 as a 2-page circular.)

Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan" in itself contains sufficient so to arouse the just indignation of the people against so-called "protection" by high tariff rates as to cause them by their votes to wrest the ownership of the government from the advocates of special privilege.

Part 2 of the plan sets forth practical methods for carrying home the truth to the people.

Note: Any Democrat in the United States may have this pamphlet reprinted locally or may purchase copies from the printer.

Prices: Per copy, 10c, by mail, postage prepaid; while type remains set up, express collect: 200 copies, \$11; 500, \$18; 1,000, \$31; 2,000, \$58; 5,000, \$140; \$10,000, \$270, from **McConnell Press, Inc.**, 52 Duane Street, New York.

Reprinted copies of Part 1 of "The Freeport Plan" may be obtained from the printer at the same prices.

DO NOT DESTROY; READ; ACT; and then hand this paper to any DEMOCRAT or to a democratic COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

Not copyrighted. Subject to change when reprinted.